

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/559,347

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin M Bernatz

Art Unit

1773

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kevin M Bernatz.(3) Raj Dave.(2) Steve Resan.(4) Rajiv Ranjan.

Date of Interview: 23 January 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ross et al. ('375, '404 and '560).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



STEVAN A. RESAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Art Unit: 1773

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants disclosed that a declaration correcting the deficiencies of the prior declaration was sent to the office, but not yet received. Applicants agreed to provide the examiners with an additional copy of this second declaration, which successfully removes Ross et al. ('375) as available prior art. However, applicants' directed the examiners' attention to Ross et al. '560, which taught similar subject matter as Ross et al. '375, yet failed to teach a thickness of < 450 Angstrom. The examiners noted that Ross et al. '404 include NiP/NiNb dual layered structures wherein the NiNb layer was < 450 Angstroms and recommended that the '404 reference be careful reviewed. Upon further consideration, the examiners suggested that using the language "directly deposited" would be sufficient to distinguish from a NiP/NiNb dual layer, though it was noted that Ross et al. '404 still disclosed the possibility of NiNb layers directly deposited on a glass substrate. The examiners further recommended that the language "glass or glass-ceramic substrate" be included to better define the invention, as well as limiting the NiNb layer to "substantially amorphous". Finally, the examiners recommended adding a positive recitation that the sealing layer prevents the migration of Li from the substrate to the magnetic layer of the magnetic recording medium. The applicants agreed to submit a preliminary amendment addressing these issues by mid-February.